

REMARKS

This responds to the Office Action mailed June 18, 2004. Claims 10-39 have been canceled without prejudice to presentation in a divisional application. Claims 1-9 remain pending, and new claims 40 and 41 have also been presented. As such, upon entry of this amendment, claims 1-9, 40 and 41 are pending, with claim 1 being the only independent claim.

Claim Objections

New claims 40 and 41 account for the range limitations deleted from claim 2 based upon the Examiner's objection to same.

Concerning claims 3 and 4 and the spelling of the term sulfate/sulphate, it is respectfully submitted that the spelling used by the applicant is the correct British spelling as used throughout the disclosure. The compound "magnesium sulphate" is specified in the disclosure in terms of its chemical structure and, as such, it is believed that no amendment is required. If the Examiner believes otherwise, the undersigned would be pleased to amend the disclosure and claims accordingly or provide telephone approval for an Examiner's amendment to that effect.

Pending Claims 1-9, 40 and 41

The pending claims stand rejected according to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable for obviousness based upon Body et al. (GB-2 301 845 A) in view of Ichinose (US-6,685,999 B2). The Examiners' reasoning is set forth in detail in the Action.

The applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection. The present invention as defined by claim 1 relates to the use of a recording sheet in a digital printing process that is carried out on a digital printing press. In particular, it relates to the use of a recording sheet in a digital printing press of the type known as the Indigo printing press, in which liquid toner is transferred onto the recording sheet by electrophotography.

The Examiner is respectfully urged to note the important distinction between a "digital printing press," as that term is used in the art and in the present application, and a conventional digital printer, such as a desktop ink jet printer. A digital printing press is distinguished from an ordinary digital printer primarily by the manner in which the toner is applied to the recording sheet, as described in full detail below, and also by the fact that a digital printing press is much faster, typically operating at a rate of over 100 pages per minute, and it is designed for extended print runs, e.g., 1000 copies or more. Digital printing presses are therefore used mainly by specialist printing companies. These presses compete directly with conventional offset printing presses and may be preferred in certain circumstances, particularly for print runs of a few thousand copies or less, since the expense of manufacturing the printing plates and the time needed to set up a conventional offset printing press can then be avoided.

The Indigo digital printing press uses a process based on electrophotography, in which a charged photoconductive surface

is used to attract oppositely charged droplets of liquid toner. The liquid toner image is then transferred from the photoconductive surface onto a blanket, which is heated to drive off the liquid, and is then bonded to the recording sheet. *This is completely different from the process used in conventional ink jet printers, in which droplets of ink are fired directly onto the recording sheet.*

Further background regarding digital printing presses and, in particular, the Indigo digital printing press, is provided in the documents attached hereto as "Exhibit A" including:

- Printing World, September 8, 1997
- Paper Europe, January 1998
- LDR: Printing Technologies, July 21, 2000
- CL Net News.Com, June 7, 2001
- European Patent App. No. 0 879 917 (11/25/1998)


The documents cited by the Examiner relate to general recording sheets for use in conventional ink jet printers. In particular, GB-2 301 845 (Body et al.) relates to a natural tracing paper for use with pigment-based inks, for example in an ink jet plotter. There is no disclosure or fair suggestion that the recording sheet is suitable for use in a digital printing press. Similarly, US-6,685,999 (Ichinose et al.) relates to a recording medium for ink jet printing in a conventional drop-on demand printer (see col. 23, lines 27-33). Here, again, there is no disclosure or fair suggestion that the recording medium is suitable for use in a digital printing press. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have no reason for supposing that the recording media disclosed in either the GB-2 301 845 or

US-6,685,999 documents would be suitable for use in a digital printing press, particularly in light of the very different processes used in digital printing presses and conventional ink jet printers.

It is also noted that the GB-2 301 845 (Body et al.) document does not include any disclosure of a filler comprising Aluminium Trihydrate, and a person of ordinary skill in the art would see no reason for combining the Body et al. and Ichinose et al. documents, particular since neither documents is concerned with a recording medium that is suitable for use on a digital printing press.

In light of the foregoing remarks, and based upon the fact that the claims relate specifically to use of a particularly defined recording sheet in a digital printing press, it is respectfully submitted that the pending claims define over the documents of record and that this application meets all other statutory requirements. As such, a formal Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Steven M. Haas (Reg. No. 37,841)
Fay, Sharpe, Fagan, Minnich & McKee, LLP
1100 Superior Avenue - Seventh Floor
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-2518
Telephone (216)861-5582
Facsimile (216)241-1666